

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-68 are pending in this application, with Claims 34-58, 63, 66, and 69 having previously been withdrawn, and Claims 1, 5, 8-11, 16, 17, 21-28, 33, 59-62, 64, 65, 67, and 68 having been amended. Support for amended Claims 1, 5, 8-11, 16, 17, 21-28, 33, 59-62, 64, 65, 67, and 68 can be found, for example, in the original claims, drawings, and specification as originally filed.¹ Applicants respectfully submit no new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-33, 59-62, 64, 65, 67, and 68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wolff (U.S. Patent No. 5,848,413) in view of Arai et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0025311; hereinafter "Arai").

In response to the rejection of Claims 1-33, 59-62, 64, 65, 67, and 68 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wolff in view of Arai, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 1 recites novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the applied references.

Amended independent Claims 1 and 17 are directed to an image forming device, including, *inter alia*:

... an operation requirement selection unit that selects one operation requirement including control information of operations allowed in connection with each type of a system according to said identification information, said system performing processing on the document....

Wolff and Arai, taken alone or in proper combination, do not disclose or suggest this element of amended Claim 1.

¹ See Figure 18, and the specification at page 23, line 20 to page 24, line 1; page 26, line 14 to page 30, line 18; and page 32, line 22 to page 33, line 10.

Arai describes a file access control system that controls the access to files based on the results of an authentication process.² Pages 2-3 of the outstanding Office Action states that Arai describes that “an access type 602 is checked and the processing routine corresponding to the access type (file open, file close, file read or write, or file delete or rename) is executed...the file reading or writing is a predetermined operation to be performed on a document.” However, Arai fails to teach or suggest an “operation requirement selection unit that selects one operation requirement including control information of operations allowed in connection with each type of a system according to said identification information, said system performing processing on the document,” as recited in Applicants' amended independent Claims 1 and 17.

Arai describes performing access control on files, e.g. data, while Applicants' independent Claim 1 is directed to controlling a device. Further, in Applicants' Claim 1, operations on a document are controlled based on the documents association with a particular type of system. Thus, in Applicants' invention, it is possible to flexibly perform comprehensive management functions and control specific processing functions of a specific document. This is distinct from Arai, which merely describes the controlling of access to data files.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Wolff fails to cure any of the above-noted deficiencies in Arai. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1 and 17 (and all claims depending thereon) patentably distinguish over Wolff and Arai, taken alone or in proper combination.

Amended independent Claims 59, 61, 64, 65, 67, and 68 recite "selecting one operation requirement including control information of operations allowed in connection with each type of a system according to said identification information, said system

² See Arai at paragraph [0003].


performing processing on the document," and are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of Claims 1-33, 59-62, 64, 65, 67, and 68 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, and in light of the above discussion, the pending claims as presented herewith are believed to be in condition for formal allowance, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAYER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)
DPB/rac

Derek P. Benke
Registration No. 56,944

I:\ATTY\DPB\24'S\243004US\243004US-AM2(MODIFIED).DOC